

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:22-cv-72

v.

Hon. Hala Y. Jarbou

EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

This is an action by an individual proceeding *in forma pauperis*. The magistrate judge has issued a report and recommendation that the Court dismiss the case for failure to state a claim because Plaintiff has not alleged “any facts which, if proven, demonstrate that the wrongs of which Plaintiff complains were committed by any Defendant.” (R&R 2, ECF No. 8.) Before the Court is Plaintiff’s objection to the R&R. (ECF No. 9.)

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court must conduct de novo review of those portions of the R&R to which objections have been made. Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

In his objection, Plaintiff states only that

[he] objects to all alleged findings of facts for DISMISSAL and reserves all rights for exhaustion of administrative remedies and all other appeals. All defendants are Pro Se Corporation and or Pro Se Agents and are in violation of Business Laws and Regulations.

(Pl.'s Obj., ECF No. 9, PageID.26.) These statements do not address any particular aspect of the R&R. Nor do they indicate that why the Court should reject the disposition recommended by the magistrate judge.

On de novo review, the Court concludes that the analysis in the R&R is sound and correctly resolves the case. Plaintiff has sued an assortment of businesses without any indication in the complaint as to what any of them did to purportedly violate Plaintiff's rights. His allegations are insufficient to state a claim.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the R&R (ECF No. 8) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as the Opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court **CERTIFIES** that an appeal by Plaintiff would not be taken in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

A judgment will enter in accordance with this order.

Dated: May 19, 2022

/s/ Hala Y. Jarbou
HALA Y. JARBOU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE